

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated August 29, 2008. Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-20 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 3, and 12 being in independent form. By the present Amendment, claims 3, 9, and 12, have been amended. Claims 8 and 16 have been canceled hereby without prejudice or disclaimer. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present Amendment.

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Leon Flores for conducting a telephone interview with the Applicant's undersigned representative on October 10, 2008. During this interview, the double patenting rejection of independent claim 1 was discussed and the rejection of claims 1 – 20 over the cited art were discussed.

During the course of this interview, tentative agreements were made, in which the Examiner agreed that independent claim 1 would be allowable over the cited art if a terminal disclaimer were to be filed and the remaining claims would be allowable if certain amendments were made. Accordingly, the agreed-upon amendments are presented herewith. A terminal disclaimer is in the process of being procured and will be filed as soon as possible. It is believed that these amendments and the terminal disclaimer will place the application in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,692. In an effort to advance prosecution, and without acknowledging the validity of this rejection, Applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 2001/051944 (“Shin”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,918,040 (“Jarvis”).

During the Interview of October 10, 2008, it was agreed that independent claim 1 would be allowable over the cited art upon the receipt of a terminal disclaimer and that independent claim 1 was patentably distinct over Shin and Jarvis at least because the cited art fails to teach or suggest, “a slave circuit in signal communication with the master circuit, where the slave circuit is reset in response to the reset control signal using the system reset signal that is generated outside of the master circuit and the slave circuit, receives the output clock signal and the output data, and sends to the master circuit an input clock signal as a feedback signal of the output clock signal and input data that is synchronized with the input clock signal, wherein the circuit to detect clock delay generates the reset control signal in response to the system reset signal or an internal reset signal, detects a delay between the output clock signal and the input clock signal, and loads and unloads the input data in response to a variable initialization parameter corresponding to the detected delay” as claimed. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art at least for this reason and dependent claim 2 is patentably distinct from the cited art at least for its dependency upon independent claim 1.

Claims 3, 5, 10, 12-13, 18, and 20 were rejected under 30 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Shin. During the Interview of October 10, 2008, it was agreed that independent claim 3 would be allowable over Shin if amended to include the following limitation, “wherein the clock forwarding circuit comprises: a clock generator, which is reset in response to output of a system clock control unit and generates a predetermined clock signal; an

internal data bus in signal communication with the clock generator, which is used for data interface with a predetermined master circuit; a data control unit in signal communication with the internal data bus, which is connected to the internal data bus and outputs data to a slave circuit in response to the predetermined clock signal; an output clock signal control unit in signal communication with the internal data bus, which outputs the output clock signal to the slave circuit in response to the predetermined clock signal; an input clock signal control unit in signal communication with the internal data bus, which receives and controls the predetermined clock signal and outputs a controlled clock signal; a load/unload clock control unit in signal communication with the internal data bus, which receives the controlled clock signal and generates load control signals and unload control signals in response to the variable initial parameter; and a load/unload multiplexer in signal communication with the internal data bus, which receives input data inputted from the slave circuit and unloads the input data to the internal data bus, through the data control unit, in response to the load control signals and the unload control signals.”

Accordingly, without acknowledging the validity of the rejection and strictly for the purposes of advancing prosecution, the requested amendment has been made and it is believed that independent claim 3 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least this reason. Similarly, dependent claims 4-7, 9-11 and 20 are patentably distinct from the cited art at least owing to their dependence upon independent claim 3.

During the Interview of October 10, 2008, it was agreed that independent claim 12 would be allowable over Shin if amended to include the following limitation, “wherein step (c) further comprises: (c1) generating a predetermined clock signal; (c2) outputting the output clock signal

to a slave circuit in response to the predetermined clock signal; (c3) receiving and controlling the predetermined clock signal, and outputting a controlled clock signal; (c4) receiving the controlled clock signal, and generating load control signals and unload control signals in response to the variable initialization parameter; and (c5) receiving input data inputted from the slave circuit, and unloading the input data in response to the load control signals and the unload control signals.”

Accordingly, without acknowledging the validity of the rejection and strictly for the purposes of advancing prosecution, the requested amendment has been made and it is believed that independent claim 12 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least this reason. Similarly, dependent claims 13-15 and 17-19 are patentably distinct from the cited art at least owing to their dependence upon independent claim 12.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph B. Gross
Reg. No. 57,109

Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
516) 692-8888 telephone
516) 692-8889 facsimile